

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2008. In the Office Action, the Patent Office states that Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 were objected to because of informalities. Additionally, in the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lautin* in view of *Ros*. Further, the Patent Office rejected Claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isenmann* in view of *Ros*. Moreover, the Patent Office rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isenmann* in view of *Ros* as applied to Claim 1 in further view of *Bienz*.

In the Office Action, the Patent office objected to Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 because of informalities. More specifically, the patent office states that in claim 1, line 2, it is not clear what constitutes the "first means" in the elected Figs. 1-5 embodiment. In claim 1, line 6, "in said case" should read —on said case—. In claim 2, line 2, it is not clear in what sense the button 87 in Fig. 14 is planar. In claim 3, line 2, there is no antecedent basis for "said docking buttons". In claim 3, line 2, it is not clear in what sense the buttons are planar. In claim 8, it is not clear what constitutes the "side loop". Applicant does not understand the Patent Office objection to first means, as no first means is mentioned in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection should be withdrawn. Further, as to the objection of the button 87 as being planar, applicant respectfully points out that in the figures, the button 87 appears to be planar with the case when inserted into slot allocated for it. Unlike some prior art where a tab or extension extends away from the carrying device, the present invention button is planar with the rest of the docking case. The advantage to this should be obvious. When the button protrudes away from the case, inadvertent unlocking and removal of the tag from the case may occur much more easily. This same response is understood to the Patent Office's objection to claim 3. As to the objection to Claim 8, applicant specifically refers the Examiner to Figure 15 which illustrates a side loop that is attached to the case that is capable of holding additional keys. The applicant has amended Claim 3 to overcome the antecedent bases issue.

The Patent Office rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lautin* (937) in view of *Ros* (951). The Patent Office states that *Lautin* teaches an elongated, generally flat case 12, a docking port 16, 24, first means 27, 60 for attaching the case to a carrying element 52, a tag 14, second means 34 for attaching the tag to

keys 40, a docking button 32 for snap fitting in the port, the docking button and docking port being mutually planar, a single docking port 16, 24 in Figure 1 and plural buttons and docking ports in Fig. 4, means 27, 60 for attaching more than one case together in end-to-end fashion, a side loop (34 for cases 12b, 12c in Fig. 4), and a spring arm (the topmost portion of button 32 in Fig. 10). Further, the Patent Office states that *Ros* teaches a second means 9, 10 including a small hole to receive a circular locking rings for holding keys, and that it would have been obvious to modify the second means 34 of *Lautin* to include a small hole to receive a circular locking ring, in view of the teaching of *Ros*, since either well known second means would function just as well in holding keys.

Amended Claim 1 requires a key inventory chest comprising a case having a docking port formed therein and a tag including second means for attaching said tag to keys, said tag is provided for each key to be located in the case and said tag further including a docking button, spaced apart from said second means, of a size and shape for lockable engagement in said docking port to temporarily fasten said keys in said case wherein said second means is the combination of a small aperture through which a locking ring is threaded and further wherein the tag includes a slot for holding a wire wound spring which attaches to the key head; wherein said docking button is arranged for snap-in fitting and locking into said docking port and releasable therefrom by digital pressure applied to said button.

Lautin teaches a key chain with a separable key chain which permits attachment and detachment of a key. The invention allows for detachment of a key from the key chain so that the remaining keys on the key chain can be carried on the person while being able to detach individual keys from the chain. The key chain has a base member having a rectangular hole extending longitudinally therethrough, and a notch through a wall of the base member. The invention also has a tongue integral with the plate and projects beyond the surface of the plate, the tongue being engageable with the end surface of the notch in the base member when the plate is inserted into the base member to secure the plate into the base member.

Ros teaches a separable key holder comprising a holder body in which a pin is fitted on either side, each pin being provided with a ring-shaped element for the accommodation of keys. The holder body consists of two portions to be detachably coupled to each other, each of the portions carrying one of the pins. The two portions of the holder body are coupled to one another

by a snap connection which can be released by an axial displacement of one of said pins in the respective portion of the holder body.

However, either *Lautin* or *Ros*, taken singly or in combination teaches or suggest a tag which is provided for each key to be located in the case provided and wherein the tag includes a slot for holding a wire wound spring which attaches to the key head as required by Claim 1 of the present invention. On the contrary, the *Lautin* 'tag' is essentially a one piece construction with no opening on the tag itself. The tag acts as the key receptacle and not the wire wound spring taught by the present invention. *Ros* does not teach of a case and tag units which are attached in snap fit to the case as required by the present invention.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lautin* (937) in view of *Ros* (951) has been overcome. Notice to that effect is requested.

Additionally, Claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isenmann* (934) in view of *Ros* (951). The Patent Office states that *Isenmann* teaches a flat, elongated case 10, first means (the top chain in Fig. 1) which enables the case to be attached to a carrying element, a docking port 42 within the case, a tag 12 having second means (the bottom chain in Fig. 1) for attaching to keys, a docking button 40, 50 for lockable engagement in the docking port of the case, a spring arm 36, the button snap-fitting within the docking port, a side loop 30 allows for holding other keys, and the top chain also allows for attaching more than one case together. The Patent Office states that *Ros* teaches a second means 9, 10 including a small hole to receive a circular locking ring. It would have been obvious to substitute a circular locking ring for the locking chain of *Isenmann*, in view of the teaching of *Ros*, since either well known type of holder for keys would function just as well.

Isenmann teaches a releasable key ring connector comprises plug and socket members shaped to fit together snugly but to separate upon pressure placed on one of them. Key supporting means on each member accommodate separate key rings.

However, either *Isenmann* or *Ros*, taken singly or in combination teach or suggest a tag which is provided for each key to be located in the case provided and wherein the tag includes a slot for holding a wire wound spring which attaches to the key head as required by Claim 1 of the present invention.

It is further submitted that the question under §103 is whether the totality of the art would collectively suggest the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. In re Simon, 461 F.2d 1387, 174 USPQ 114 (CCPA 1972).

That elements, even distinguishing elements, are disclosed in the art is alone insufficient. It is common to find elements somewhere in the art. Moreover, most if not all elements perform their ordained and expected functions. The test is whether the invention as a whole, in light of the teaching of the reference, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

It is insufficient that the art disclosed components of Applicants invention. A teaching, suggestion, or incentive must exist to make the combination made by Applicants. Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isenmann* in view of *Ros* (951) has been overcome. Notice to that effect is requested.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isenmann* in view of *Ros* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Bienz* (498). *Bienz* teaches a single docking port 8 and button 6. It would have been obvious to use a single docking button and port with the key holder of *Isenmann*, in view of the teaching of *Bienz*, the motivation being to simplify release of the key holding parts.

Claims 2-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 depend from Claim 1. These claims are further believed allowable for the same reasons set forth with respect to independent Claim 1 since the claims sets forth an additional novel step of Applicant's Multi-Key Holder with Individual Docking Ports.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the application are in allowable form and that the application is now in condition for allowance. If any outstanding issues remain, Applicant urges the Patent Office to telephone Applicant's attorney so that the same may be resolved and the application expedited to issue. Applicant requests the Patent Office to indicate all claims as allowable and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 8, 2008

By: 

Hani Z. Sayed

Registration No. 52,544

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
611 Anton Blvd. Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626
Phone: (714) 641-5100
Facsimile: (714) 546-9035